

## REMARKS

The last Office Action of August 3, 2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5 and 7 have been amended. Claims 9-19 have been added. No claims have been canceled. No amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hamann et al. (US 6,825,633).

It is noted with appreciation that claim 5 is indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating subject matter recited in claim 5, which has been indicated allowable. Claims 2, 3, 5-8 and new claims 15 and 17 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1 and should therefore be allowable for at least the reasons that amended claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 5 has been retained in amended form to recite that the shape functions are weighted by a single parameter, as disclosed in paragraph [0050], equation (6). New claim 15 recites that the shape functions are weighted by multiple parameters, as disclosed in paragraph [0073], equation (13).

Additional shape functions recited in claims 17 and 18 are disclosed in paragraph [0074] of the specification.

The rejection of original claim 4 as being anticipated by Hamann is hereby respectfully traversed.

A new independent claim 9 has been added to include the limitations of original claims 1 and 4.

With respect to new claim 9, Hamann discloses that the frequencies of the bandstop filter (blocking frequencies) can be adapted by presetting various parameters jerk, acceleration and velocity. The frequencies of the bandstop filter

can also be adapted by changing the shape of the jerk profile by predefining a corresponding shape function for a jerk value of the jerk profile. However, Hamann fails to teach or suggest at least that the blocking frequency can be adjusted by adjusting a parameter  $\alpha$  of a parameter-dependent shape function obtained by adding a rectangular shape function and a  $\cos^2$  or  $\sin^2$  shape function, as recited in claim 9. Using the parameter  $\alpha$  (or several parameters  $\alpha_i$ ) allows a convenient adjustment of the blocking frequencies, as discussed, for example, in paragraph [0073] of the specification, and no such adjustment is taught or suggested by Hamann.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that Hamann neither teaches nor suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claim 9.

As for the rejection of the dependent claims 4, 10-14, these claims depend on claim 9, share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Claims 17 and 18 recite additional shape functions, as disclosed in paragraph [0074] of the specification.

Applicant acknowledges the similarity of Fig. 2 in the instant application and the Hamann patent. However, the system shown in Fig. 2 is not claimed, and Fig. 2 is merely used for illustration and may be labeled as "Prior Art" if required by the Examiner.

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the claims on file. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

Applicant believes that when reconsidering the claims in the light of the above comments, the Examiner will agree that the invention is in no way properly met or anticipated or even suggested by any of the references however they are considered.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen  
Agent For Applicant  
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: October 25, 2006  
350 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 4714  
New York, N.Y. 10118  
(212)244-5500  
HMF/WS:af